

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

IN RE CITIGROUP, INC.,)	
CAPITAL ACCUMULATION)	
PLAN LITIGATION,)	MDL-1354 (REK)
)	
)	
JOHNIE F. WEEMS, III,)	
on behalf of himself and others)	
similarly situated,)	D. MASS. C.A. NO. 1:00-11912-REK
Plaintiffs)	(ALL CASES)
v.)	
)	
CITIGROUP, INC.,)	
TRAVELERS GROUP, INC.,)	
SALOMON SMITH BARNEY)	
HOLDINGS,)	MEMORANDUM IN EXPLANATION
SALOMON SMITH BARNEY)	AND
INC., and)	PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE
PRIMERICA FINANCIAL)	ORDER NO. 17
SERVICES, INC.,)	
Defendants)	
)	

PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE ORDER
UNDER 28 U.S.C. §1407(a)
Order No. 17
March 3, 2004

Practice and Procedure Order No. 17 supplements and does not supercede Practice and Procedure Orders 6-16.

The following cases have been transferred to me in connection with this multi-district litigation since the previous Practice and Procedure Order: Webb v. Citigroup, Inc., et. al., 03-CV-11400-REK, Udall v. Citigroup, Inc., et. al., 03-CV-11835-REK, Cancienne v. Citigroup, Inc., et. al.,

03-CV-12607, and Gilmore v. Citigroup, Inc., et. al., 04-CV-10273-REK.

Any pending motions in the transferor courts should be re-filed in this court for disposition. All filings should be captioned as is this Practice and Procedure Order, except that if the filing applies to some but not all of the consolidated cases, the appropriate civil action numbers should replace the text “all cases.”

In Webb, the plaintiff has re-filed in this court the Representative Plaintiff’s Motion to Remand (Docket No. 3) and the Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to Amend Complaint and Memorandum of Law in Support (Docket No. 4). The parties have also filed a stipulation (Docket No. 2) in which they agree that the pending motions raise issues analogous to those I addressed in Practice and Procedure Orders 14 and 15. In the stipulation, the parties agreed that the motion to remand should be denied, and the motion to amend should be allowed.

For the foregoing reasons, it is ORDERED that the Representative Plaintiff’s Motion to Remand (Docket No. 3 in Webb) is DENIED, and the Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to Amend Complaint (Docket No. 4 in Webb) is ALLOWED. The Plaintiff is directed to file the amended complaint with the Clerk.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that a case management conference is set for March 30, 2004 at 2:00 p.m. All other motions pending in this litigation will be heard at that time.

_____/s/ Robert E. Keeton_____
Robert E. Keeton
Senior United States District Judge